Docket No. 50-336 File No. RI-90-A-132



Subject: RESOLUTION OF CONCERNS

On you discussed with an NRC inspector, Scott Stewart, a number of concerns. We have reviewed these items and have decided on the following actions:

- Issue 1.a "Wrong fuses tagged" (Memo to P. Habighorst, August 21, 1990)
  The issue has been provided to the licensee for review. We will review the licensee response and provide a summary of our review in a subsequent inspection report.
- Issue 1.b "Incomplete tagout" (Memo to P. Habighorst, August 21, 1990)
  The issue has been provided to the licensee for review. We will review the licensee response and provide a summary of our review in a subsequent inspection report.
- Issue 1.c "Inadequate P & ID for lights on the 45 ft. level" (Memo to P. Habighorst, August 21, 1990)
  This issue is not of regulatory concern, but rather is a personnel safety issue. The issue has been provided to the licensee for their review. We intend no followup action.
- Issue 2.a "RCP Oil" (Memo to P. Habighorst August 22, 1990)
  We will review this issue and document the results of our review in an inspection report.
- Issue 2.b "Alara" (Memo to P. Habighorst August 22, 1990)
  We will review this issue and document the results of our review in an inspection report.
- Issue 3 "On-Call Electrician" (Memo to P. Habighorst August 27, 1990)
  The licensee primarily employs a radiopager system which is tested daily, to implement the emergency response capability. The backup to the radiopagers is the on-call phone list. The licensee has been informed of the phone list discrepancy. This issue is closed.

Information in this record was deleted in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, exemptions

9212220021 920608 PDR FDIA GUILD91-162 PDR

M82

Issue 4.a. peeting with Mr. Stewart, you requested that the basis for At the NRC resolution of your concerns and to whom you could appeal these decisions be provided to you. We have attempted in the past in responding to your concerns to provide you with a brief description of the basis for our decisions. We will continue this practice. We will gladly respond to any requests from you in writing for further explanation of the basis for any of our conclusions. The NRC has no formal appeal process for the followup and resolution of allegations. However, if you would like us to reconsider any of our decisions we will gladly respond to requests in writing; again, please provide us with your reason for considering our actions to be improper or inadequate. We will consider any additional information that you provide in deciding to reconsider previously closed issues.

At the meeting with Mr. Stewart, you requested to see an internal tracking document for resolution of your concerns. Your request in this case falls under the "Freedom of Information Act Regulations," Subpart A to 10 CFR 9 "Public Records." Your rights and the procedures to obtain NRC records are provided in this Part, which is attached to this letter for your use. Also provided, for your information is a copy of the NRC procedure for management and processing of allegations.

At the meeting with Mr. Stewart, you stated that the Durr report (50-336, IR 89-13) did not attach proper significance to violations of regulations that you had identified. I believe that the enforcement actions in Inspection Report 50/336, 89-13 were proper. Attached to this correspondence are the applicable sections of 10 CFR Part 2, Appendix C (1990), which provides our enforcement guidelines and the recommended severity levels for violations.

We appreciate your informing us of your concerns and feel that our actions in this matter have been responsive to those concerns. Should you have any additional questions, or if I can be of further assistance in this matter, please call me collect at (215) 337-5225.

Sincerely.

Original Signed By

Edward C. Wenzinger, Chief Reactor Projects Branch 4

Enclosures:

(a) 10CFR9, Subpart A

(b) NRC Manual Chapter NRC-0517 "Management of Allegations" April 30, 1990

(c) 10CFR2, Appendix C